

REMARKS

By this response, Applicants amend Claim 1 and, therefore, Claims 1-12 and 40 are pending in the present Application. In view of the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Explicit support for the amendment to independent Claim 40 is found in the Specification of the present Application, page 8, line 4 to page 9, line 6.

Claims 1-12 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,118,426 to Albert, et al.[herein referred to as "Albert" or "'426 patent"]. Applicants' assert that Albert does not anticipate the flexible liquid crystal display element claimed by Applicants. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See also MPEP § 2131.02. "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK  
CHEN & HEID LLP

2402 Nicholson Drive  
SUITE 210  
Irvine, CA 92614  
(949) 752-7040  
FAX (949) 752-7049

The Examiner states:

Albert et al disclose an article of clothing comprising at least one material (fig. 9); a flexible body attached to the article of clothing (502), at least one integrated circuit supported within the flexible body (col. 18, lines 51-67); and a flexible display element supported within the flexible body (col. 18, lines 51-67).

Office Action, p. 2.

In response, Applicants aver that Albert does not expressly or inherently describe each and every element as set forth in amended Claim 1. Specifically, Albert neither teaches nor describes, expressly nor inherently, "a wearable device comprising ... a flexible liquid crystal display element supported within the flexible body" as claimed by Applicants."

Indeed, Albert teaches away from the use of liquid crystal displays. In support, Applicants respectfully bring the following exemplary passages from Albert to the attention of the Examiner. First, Albert sets the stage for advancing the advantages of electrophoretic displays by highlighting **problems and disadvantages** alleged to be inherent in **liquid crystal displays**:

Despite much effort directed to developing highly-flexible, reflective display media, there are relatively few examples of displays formed on semi-flexible substrates, and these examples have found only moderate success. For example, plastic-based liquid crystal displays, including twisted nematic (TN), supertwisted nematic (STN), polymer dispersed liquid crystal (PDLC), and bistable cholesteric liquid crystals have been developed. Nevertheless, **problems remain with liquid crystal alignment in TN and STN displays, cholesteric displays are sensitive to changes in their cell gap, and local stress can cause changes in the scattering or absorbance of PDLC and cholesteric films. As such, only**

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK  
CHEN & HEID LLP

2402 Michelson Drive  
SUITE 210  
IRVINE, CA 92612  
(949) 752-7040  
FAX (949) 752-7049

*moderate flexibility can be achieved with these displays.*

Albert '426 patent, Col. 1, line 57-Col. 2, line 3 (emphasis added). Later in the '426 patent specification, Albert implies the undesirability of liquid crystal displays, relative to the electrophoretic display: "A number of display materials are suitable for such an application. However, some of these display materials, such as a liquid crystal display, require a more complex cell in their manufacture." (Albert '426 patent, col. 9, lines 2-4) [emphasis added].

Next, Albert unequivocally sets forth his invention:

*The invention features a printable display comprising an encapsulated electrophoretic display medium. The resulting display is flexible. Since the display media can be printed, the display itself can be made inexpensively.*

Albert '426 patent, Col. 2, lines 24-27 (emphasis added).

Thus, Albert's teaching of an electrophoretic display medium is distinct from Applicants' claimed liquid crystal display element.

Albert makes clear and unequivocal that the display element of the '426 patent is directed to a printable display element, which may be produced using "all forms of printing":

*Throughout the specification, reference will be made to printing or printed. As used throughout the specification, printing is intended to include all forms of printing and coating col. 3, l. 13-16 ... A "printed element" refers to an element formed using any one of the above techniques.*

Albert '426 patent, Col. 3, lines 21-33 (emphasis added).

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON & WOK  
CHEN & REED LLP  
2402 Michelson Drive  
SUITE 210  
Irvine, CA 92612  
(949) 752-7640  
FAX (949) 752-7049

In addition, unlike the liquid crystal display element claimed by Applicants, the printed display element of Albert requires specific electrochemical requirements to be met in order to create a printable electrophoretic display, for example:

The successful construction of an encapsulated electrophoretic display requires the proper interaction of several different types of materials and processes, such as a polymeric binder and, optionally, a capsule membrane. These materials must be chemically compatible with the electrophoretic particles and fluid, as well as with each other. The capsule materials may engage in useful surface interactions with the electrophoretic particles, or may act as a chemical or physical boundary between the fluid and the binder.

Albert '426 patent, Col. 3, lines 3-11.

Therefore, Applicants' claimed liquid crystal display element is distinctly different from the printable electrophoretic display described by Albert, at al.

Time and again, Albert expressly or implicitly defines the **electrically addressable display** taught in the '426 patent as an **electrically active display that is printable**, unlike Applicants' Claimed liquid crystal display screen. In further support of Albert's disparate teachings, Applicants draw Examiner's attention, for example, to Col. 4, line 11 ("printing a display media on the first surface of the film"); Col. 4., line 29, 36 ("printing an electrically active ink"); Col. 4, lines 33-34 ("a process for printing an electrically addressable display"). Indeed, with regard to a wearable display, which includes an electrically addressable display,

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK  
CHEN & HEID LLP

3402 Michelson Drive  
SUITE 210  
IRVINE, CA 92612  
(949) 753-7040  
FAX (949) 752-7049

Albert once again unequivocally states, "the display media is printed onto the backplane." Col. 18, line 63 (See Col. 2, lines 24-27).

Because of the above-identified differences and disparities between Alberts' printable electrophoretic display element and Applicants' claimed liquid crystal display element, the asserted anticipation rejection under 35 USC §102(e) overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Albert, and that corresponding dependent Claims 2-12 and 40 also are distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of Claims 1-12 and 40 be withdrawn.

By this Response, Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot.

No additional search is indicated or warranted. Applicants consider the amendatory language of Claim 1 to be fully within scope of any previous searches encompassing the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification, In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 44 USPQ2d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1997), as well as within the breadth or scope of

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK  
CHEN & HEID LLP

3402 Michelson Drive  
SUITE 210  
Irvine, CA 92617  
(949) 752-7040  
FAX (949) 752-7049


the Parent Application, as well as of one or more variant but anticipatory embodiments.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-12 and 40 are in proper form for allowance, or in better condition for appeal. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested and a timely Notice of Allowance is kindly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding any aspect of the application, please call the undersigned at (949) 752-7040.


Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Commissioner for Patents, Fax No. 571-273-8300 on the date stated below.

  
John F. O'Rourke

February 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

  
John F. O'Rourke  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,985

LAW OFFICES OF  
MACPHERSON KWOK  
CHEN & HEID LLP

2402 Michelson Drive  
SUITE 210  
Irvine, CA 92612  
(949) 752-7040  
FAX (949) 752-7049